

## REMARKS

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

#### Claims 1, 31, 36 and 39

Claims 1-29 and 31-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Dessiatnikov, Dmitry “Securing SZL Connection String”(GIAC Security Essentials Certification Practical Assignment – version 1.4b Option 1 SANS Institute January 8, 2004) (*Dessiatnikov*). Applicant submits claims 1-29 and 31-43 are not anticipated *Dessiatnikov* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

requesting connection information from an application server to another node;  
accessing a key phrase to decrypt the requested connection information, responsive to the request for the connection information; and  
obtaining the requested connection information from a secure storage file in a file system.

Independent claims 31, 36 and 39 recite similar limitations. The Office action cites *Dessiatnikov* as disclosing the limitations of claim 1. In particular, *Dessiatnikov* is cited as disclosing obtaining requested connection information from a secure storage file.

However, the Office action does not assert that *Dessiatnikov* discloses obtaining requested connection information from a secure storage file in a file system. The cited portion of *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose obtaining requested connection information from a secure storage file, let alone disclose that the secure storage file is in a file system. See section entitled, “Storage of connection strings.”

*Dessiatnikov* specifically suggests placing the connection string outside of the file system (see “Security through obscurity”), for example, by storing the connection string

in the Windows registry (see “Windows registry”). However, *Dessiatnikov* does not suggest or disclose storing the connection string in the file system in a secure storage file. Thus, Applicant submits *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose obtaining the requested connection information from a secure storage file in a file system, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 1, 31, 36 and 39 are not anticipated by *Dessiatnikov*.

Claims 2-17 depend from claim 1. Claims 32-35 depend from claim 31. Claims 37-38 depend from claim 36. Claims 40-43 depend from claim 39. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 2-17, 32-35, 37-38 and 40-43 are not anticipated by *Dessiatnikov* for at least the same reasons claims 1, 31, 36 and 39 are not anticipated.

#### Claim 18

Claim 18 recites, in part, a central directory to store a value string and to provide the value string to the application server responsive to receiving the key phrase from the application server. The Office action cites *Dessiatnikov* as disclosing a central repository to store a value string. Applicant has not claimed a central repository; thus, the premise of the rejection is erroneous.

Regardless, *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose a central directory to store a value string and to provide the value string to the application server responsive to receiving the key phrase from the application server. The cited portion of *Dessiatnikov* merely states the protection of connection strings is a critical issue; the cited portion makes no express or inherent references to a central directory or to providing a value string to an application server in response to receiving a key phrase from the application server. For at least

these reasons, Applicant submits *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is not anticipated by *Dessiatnikov*.

Claims 19-29 depend from claim 18. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 19-29 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons claim 18 is not anticipated.

#### Claim 30

The Office action makes no assertion that claim 30 is unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant is left to assume that claim 30 contains allowable subject matter. This conclusion seems logical to Applicant given that the prior art, including *Dessiatnikov*, fails to disclose that the data store of the central directory may be transitioned from storing unencrypted data to storing encrypted data.


#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account  
number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: October 2, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jared S. Engstrom  
Reg. No 58,330  
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(503) 439-8778